CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY MONTHLY MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BYRON SHER AUDITORIUM

1001 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2014 9:08 A.M.

Reported by:

Kent J. Odell

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS

Dan Richard, Chairman

Tom Richards, Vice Chair

Jim Hartnett, Vice Chair

Michael Rossi

Thea Selby

Lynn Schenk

Jeff Morales

Rick Frank

Katherine Perez-Estolano

Patrick Henning

STAFF

Janice Neibel

ALSO PRESENT

Michelle Boehm

Tom Fellenz

Scott Jarvis

The Honorable Bonnie Lowenthal

Janet Dawson, Assembly Transportation Committee

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Janice Mathurin

B.T. Lewis

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

ALSO PRESENT

Dr. Bruce McAllister

Leroy Candler

Rev. Richard Daniels

Frank Oliveira

Ross Browning

Diana LaCome

Paul Guerrero

Robert Allen

Marvin Dean

	INDEX	PAGE
Roll	Call	1
Publ	ic Comment	2
1. Aı	Consider Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from ugust 12 Board Meeting	33
2.	Commendation of the Honorable Bonnie Lowenthal for her Service as Chair of the Assembly Committe on Transportation	58 e
3.	Consider Delegating Authority to the CEO to Review and Certify Proposed Advertising Displays at High-Speed Rail Multimodal Transit Facilities	34
4.	Consider Approval of an Amendment to the Nossaman LLP Contract for Time and Budget Los Angeles County	36
5.	Consider Providing Approval to Issue a Request for Qualifications for Environmental/Engineering Services on the Palmdale to Burbank Project Secti	61 on

	<u>INDEX CONTINUED</u>	PAGE
6.	Update on the Procurement for the Program Management Team Contract and Next Steps to Los Angeles/Anaheim Corridor	67
7.	Closed Session Pertaining to Litigation	79
8.	Reporter's Certificate	85
9.	Transcriber's Certificate	86

1	<u>PROCEEDINGS</u>
2	9:08 a.m.
3	PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:08 A.M.
4	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2014
5	VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Good morning. If we can
6	have the Board members take their seats and we'll start the
7	meeting shortly.
8	BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: We can start it now.
9	VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: I want to make sure
10	everybody's at the dais that's here. Okay.
11	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Shesan (phonetic) indicates
12	these people should go first, they're all together.
13	VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Okay. Great, if we could
14	start with the roll call and then we'll do the Pledge of
15	Allegiance, please.
16	MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk? Ms. Schenk?
17	BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Here.
18	MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?
19	VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Here.
20	MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Hartnett?
21	VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Here.
22	MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?
23	BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Here.
24	MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?
25	BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Here.

1 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning? 2 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Here. MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank? 3 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: 4 Here. 5 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby? BOARD MEMBER SELBY: 6 Here. 7 MS. NEIBEL: And Chairman Richard? VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: I'm sorry, he's on the way. 8 9 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He should be here, en route. UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Then who's the Chair? 10 VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: And I'm here. 11 12 Okay. All right, if you could please stand and 13 we'll have the Pledge of Allegiance led by Director Rossi. (Whereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.) 14 15 VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: As you know, we start out with public comment. This is for comment by the public on 16 17 any of our agenda items as well as just general public 18 comments as to items that are not on the agenda. 19 I have a number of speaker cards. I understand 20 that -- with respect to -- I think there's a group of five 21 that has divided up their time, if I have these in the right 2.2 order. And I apologize if I mispronounce a name or miss 2.3 someone in order. But I -- I will call out three names and I'd ask the first person that I call out to approach the 24 25 podium for their public presentation and the others to be

1 ready.

2.2

2.3

First is Ms. Janice Mathurin. After that I have B.T. Lewis and Dr. Bruce McAllister.

MS. MATHURIN: Good morning, my name is Janice Mathurin and I'm the Director --

(Microphone issues)

MS. MATHURIN: This is it? This is it? Okay. Good morning. Okay. You can hear me now? Okay, great.

My name is Janice Mathurin and I am the Director of West -- the Director of Operations at West Fresno Family Resource Center. It's a community-based organization that's located in southwest Fresno and we're dedicated to empowering and supporting the community to achieve optimal health and well-being.

I'm also a member of Voice and Voice is a diverse coalition of stakeholders and leaders from organizations throughout the Central Valley. We have committed ourselves to ensuring that the voices of those we represent will be heard on this important question of public investment leading to good jobs and bright futures.

We are leaders from labor, religious and community-based organization that was formed early this year to ensure that the Central Valley most disadvantaged workers are not left behind during the construction of the high-speed rail and other massive public work projects.

Our Voice members actually includes Faith in

Community, Feed My Sheep Ministry, Fellowship Ministry,

Fellowship Ministry Baptist Church, Rising Star Missionary

Baptist Church, Saints Rest Baptist Church, Saints Community

Church of God and Christ, San Joaquin Construction Academy,

Service Employee International Union Local 1000, West Fresno

Family Resource Center and Westside Church of God.

2.2

2.3

We believe in the power of numbers and about the power of this group, the many families that represents — that it represents in terms of numbers. The combination of community-based in the pews and neighborhoods plus a strong community-based organization such as West Fresno Family Resource Center plus a strong statewide labor union says much about our commitment and our desire to see individuals and their families get themselves on the path to economic health.

And we want to see our communities become healthier places to live. We want to see a much stronger public focus on the needs of our most disadvantaged communities. We need more ambitious goals to prepare, goals for preparation, job training and placement. These goals must be supported with adequate funding to get the job done.

I also would like to present to the Board copies of our findings. And do I pass it out -- this out or?

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: (Inaudible)

```
MS. MATHURIN: Okay. Okay.
 1
 2
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you.
              MS. MATHURIN: And I also would like -- like to
 3
 4
    take this opportunity to have all of those represented by
 5
    our group who came all the way from the Central Valley here
    with us, if you will kindly stand for us.
 6
 7
               (Audience members stand)
              MS. MATHURIN: Okay.
 8
 9
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you for being here.
              MS. MATHURIAN: Thank you. Thank you for your
10
11
    time.
12
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you.
13
              Reverend B.T. Lewis followed by Dr. Bruce
14
    McAllister followed by Dr. Bruce McAllister followed by
15
    Mr. Leroy Candler.
16
              REVEREND LEWIS: Good morning Board Chair and
17
    Board members. Thank you for giving us this time to come
18
    and share some of our concerns with you this morning.
19
              My name is Pastor B.T. Lewis. I'm the senior
20
    pastor of the Rising Star Missionary Baptist Church.
    also the President of the West Fresno Faith-Based
21
2.2
    Organization, a collaborative of pastors. And then I'm also
2.3
    a board member on Faith and Community, which is part of the
    PICO Network and PICO stands for People Improving
24
25
    Communities Through Organizing.
```

And so we are -- we're here today, because we're concerned about the process, the hiring and preparation process for high-speed rail. We've studied the process and we've documented in detail the inequities of the high-speed rail outreach and hiring process.

2.2

We could -- what could be a pipeline to hope, has for many, become another experience of hopelessness and disappointment. The project has the potential to change the financial trajectory of many families in our valley and in our state and to raise the quality of life for those families for many years to come. From my own personal experience it only took one job to create one career and that one job and that one career changed my family's life forever.

And so we're here to partner with you, to look for ways to partner with you to address some of the subjective limitations in the outreach and hiring process that we've experienced in the Valley. We want to make the milestones in the process more objective and equitably sound.

We have people, congregants, in our memberships that have experienced the outreach and hiring process in the Valley. And it has not always been fair nor kind. And so it is -- it is our belief that this project should include effective components of preparation and integration to avoid perpetuating a systemic climate of segregation.

It is my interest, and the interest of my colleagues, the others I collaborate with in Voice, and it is the interest of my fellow Fresnoans that the every person be judged by the content of their character. And be given fair and equitable opportunity to pursue happiness and prosperity for their families for years to come.

2.2

2.3

Our hope and expectation is that this project will change the landscape of poverty in a city that holds the reputation for having one of the highest concentrations of poverty in our nation. High-speed rail is more than just an opportunity for a job. It can literally change the lives of families in our community. And then it can therefore change the landscape, the economic landscape, of our entire community.

And so we're looking for an opportunity to work with you in this process. We want to work with you to help this process become an effective and influential process that will ensure the best possible results for our constituency. And so, in closing, I'd just like to say that we look forward to working with you. We look forward to engaging you further in some of the details of how we can make this happen. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you very much, Reverend.

The next is Reverend Dr. Bruce McAllister followed

1 | by Leroy and Candler and Reverend Richard Daniels.

1.3

2.2

2.3

DR. MCALLISTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Board this morning.

I am the senior pastor of Saints Community Church of God and Christ in Fresno, a member of the West Fresno Minister Alliance and West Fresno Faith-Based Organization, also a commissioner with the Economic Opportunities

Commission in Fresno.

I want to talk for a moment just from the heart. I don't have any notes before me, but I just want to talk from the heart for a moment. We left Fresno this morning a little bit after 5:00 a.m. coming to Sacramento. And just think what it could've been like if we had all been on high-speed rail moving from Fresno to Sacramento.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{VICE}}$ CHAIR HARTNETT: We've been thinking about that for a long time.

DR. MCALLISTER: But listen, we are excited Chairman and we're looking forward to that.

As a pastor, as a minister, and with many of my colleagues who are here and others who are back in Fresno every Sunday morning we have been given the awesome task of being what we call the watcher men on the wall. And every Sunday morning we see men, we see women coming to our congregations, many who are unemployed, many who are hurting, many who are struggling.

And I got involved in this personally, because it was a personal interest. And I don't mind, you know, being transparent in this. Because I understand that if families are doing well -- because I've taken a holistic approach to ministry -- and I know that if families are doing well economically then there's a good chance that other areas of their life will also go well with them as well as spiritually, emotionally and socially. All the things that are important in making up human beings.

2.2

2.3

And so my investment in this is to see that folks from my community and some of my parishioners be able at some point and time -- and I know that this is not an overnight process -- but at some point and time be able to access some of those jobs. Have a fair chance at getting those jobs. And also even being prepared to the move to the level where they can get those jobs.

And we're not asking that standards be lowered by any means, but if we can help prepare then I think those of us in ministry, as we collaborate with labor and community organizations, we will have really felt that we've done our job if we can improve the quality of life for those who are unemployed and underemployed.

Mr. Chairman, thank you so much sir, for this time.

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you very much,

1 Reverend. 2 Mr. Leroy Candler and then Reverend Richard 3 Daniels. 4 MR. CANDLER: Good morning. Good morning. It's a 5 pleasure to be here this morning and I appreciate the opportunity to speak before this distinguished group of 6 7 people. My name is Leroy Candler. I am the outreach 8 9 coordinator for the Central Region Valley SEIU Local 1000. We are state workers of all kinds and I am a Caltrans 10 11 employee. I have been a state worker for over 20 years now. 12 There are almost 8,000 SEIU members along the 99 Corridor throughout the Central Valley and the region. 1.3 14 committed to working hard to making sure that our 15 communities are healthy places to work and to raise our 16 families. 17 As I look over the audience this morning I am awfully pleased to be here. When I first started out on 18 this journey it was because of the fact that I was --19 20 actually I'm a delegate for the Central Labor Council. 21 I was at a meeting and I heard that they were having 2.2 meetings in my community, where I come from, that were given 2.3 at some of the pastors' churches, some of who I knew. And I grew up in Fresno, in fact I live there 2.4 25 right now. My family's there. My grandfather come here in

the 1940s where he brought a plot of land and he brought 11 of his children here. And all of them have become very productive in the City of Fresno, but since that time a lot of things have changed. And there's people here that don't have the opportunity to have a fair -- a decent life and to raise their family -- anything.

2.2

2.3

So I decided from that meeting at the Central Labor Council that it didn't seem like the word was getting out in the right places to get our people to have a right chance for the right meeting. And the information that was being given to me wasn't that the information was incorrect, it just wasn't complete enough to give the people a fair chance. So I asked for a -- some information that I thought I should have been received.

And I wasn't received well, and it wasn't given to me as well, so it started me to thinking. And I contacted my president, Ms. Yvonne Walker, SEIU 1000. And well, she had challenged me a couple of years ago to be more active in my community. And I told her I just had just the right thing that was very necessary for us to get involved with my community if we were going to have a chance to improve our community.

We have a mission statement that we try to live by and we try to make that mission statement a living document and it has come to fruition. When I first started down this

journey it didn't seem as if I could get anybody to listen to the fact that if the high-speed rail start tomorrow, the only people that was going to be left out was the people that was in West Fresno, because they wouldn't have a chance for any of these jobs.

2.2

And I'm thankful for this time and I'm not going to try to beat anybody up. And I didn't come here to criticize anybody. Actually, I've come here to give thanks to you for welcoming us to come in, to open the door for us for further communications. And I'm just thankful for the process that we have went through and I'm thankful for the experience. And I've met Mr. Jeff Morales, Ms. Diane Gomez and I met Mr. Tom Richards and things are looking for productive. And I'm thankful that we're going to have further communications.

And with that I will say good evening.

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you, sir.

Reverend Richard Daniels?

REVEREND DANIELS: Good morning. My name is
Reverend Richard Daniels. I'm the pastor of the Fellowship
Baptist Church in Fresno, California and part of the Voice
group that have met since May of this year to deal with many
of the things the speakers before me have already said. The
system is broken and it needs fixing.

Part of it that gets us -- my community, my

people, our people, poor people, hard-working people who live at real addresses on real streets in Fresno from unemployment to employment -- the inadequacy of resources for funds, for getting them trained and placed, is obvious even through an agency that's been in this city for 15 years, the West Fresno Family Resource Center, and many others. Our challenge to you today is -- and I thank you for the privilege. I thank you for allowing us to be here and even having shown some interest in meeting with us in the Fresno region. And we want you, we invite you to come and sit with us and shoulder to shoulder with this group called Voice, that I'm proud to be a part of, to see what we can do together to make this process a lot easier.

2.2

2.3

I would to God today that the high-speed rail had been in place. And I wouldn't have had to drive all that distance from 4:00 in the morning to be here to speak for two minutes. I think I long for that day as I approach 45 years of ministry and 68 years of living.

I'm grateful. I thank you, but I want to see our community progress and I think as we come together as partners we can make that happen together. Thank you so much for allowing us this privilege.

And may I say, the people who came on this bus are true representatives of our community. They are seniors, mothers and fathers and grandmothers and grandfathers, some

```
perhaps even looking for work. And I thank them for coming
and showing. It's been said that the community didn't care.
We wanted to bring them here, not to beat anybody up, but
to say, "We do care." Thank you.
          VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank, you Reverend.
                                                     Thank
you very much, Reverend.
          The first five speakers were each designated as
from the Voice Coalition. And we grouped them together as
representatives of the large number of people who came. And
in consideration of consolidating down the number of
speakers I allocated -- letting my fellow Board members know
that I allocated more than the two minutes per person, so
that they could adequately address us.
          And we appreciate how you've organized and that
you're all here. And also appreciate to receive the written
materials that have been provided to us. And as you know,
our staff will be following up as well, so thank you for
making the trip. And I hope it'll next time, be on a train.
          And I'll turn it over our esteemed Chair to go
through the rest of the speaker cards.
          VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Mr. Chairman, if I may?
          VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Certainly.
          VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: And stepping out of order,
please don't leave. Please don't leave yet.
```

I just wanted to -- I think as many of you know

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

that I am a proud resident of this great community of

Fresno. And I couldn't be more proud to sit up here and
look at all of you there.

2.2

2.3

I think Reverend McAllister said something that's really important. We all know that you don't need to reduce the standards. What we need to do is equalize the opportunity. Okay?

And I think I can certainly speak for myself, I know, with regards to our staff, our CEO Jeff Morales who I've talked to, Diana Gomez who I think some of you have met with, Oliver Baines who I've been talking at length with over the last few days. We are committed to help achieve those same goals for the Fresno community as well as the State of California.

We're not going to solve all the problems that we've got in the Central Valley or in our community, but we can certainly help make a dent. And we can certainly do what we can do as an organization in utilizing the tools we put in place with our small business and minority business and disadvantaged business criteria to give the greatest opportunity we can for the people who really are close to my heart. And those are the ones from West Fresno, who have suffered as we all know in our local community, for years for equalized opportunity.

So I have to tell you, speaking for myself and

those who I've mentioned, that we look forward to standing with you. I will work tirelessly with Oliver and with our staff to try to generate the results that we all would be proud of.

2.2

2.3

What I can tell you is that, as you well know, we're not a training organization and we are not given training funds. But through the Governor's Office last year the first step in terms of funding that was available has been utilized well. And that was about a million-and-a-half dollar grant, which was spread over a couple of the regional workforce investment boards.

The Fresno Regional Workforce Investment Board, of which I was the Chair at the time, got the advantage of about half of it. What I can tell you that program has done to date, we had about 1,800 people who were screened. We had about 375 people who have been qualified for training, 104 as I understand it have graduated, 75 have been placed.

Now, it's only a beginning. Quite clearly and as I understand it, it's not that many of them have found employment with high-speed rail. But from my perspective it was still, and is a success, because what was most important was good-paying jobs for people who were unemployed.

So we want you to keep your voices strong and we look forward to working with you. And thanks again very much, for coming. It's very meaningful for us.

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Dan? Dan?

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, first of all welcome everybody. I apologize for being late, but my colleagues clearly have taken this issue very seriously. And my colleague Vice Chair Tom Richards, we're just so fortunate to have him representing the communities in the Central Valley on this body.

Ms. Schenk?

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you know, it is very unusual for us to respond to public comment and in the years I've been on this Board I don't think I've ever done it. But I just wanted to say to those of you who got up at 4:00 in the morning to come here, and even though some of you only spoke for two minutes and some of you didn't speak, how very much I appreciate your being here in the face of loud voices and criticism.

Having you here bolsters my faith in this project and what it can do in the Central Valley, what it can do for the State of California not only in getting people here in a reasonable amount of time, but the job creation, the environmental protection. And I pledge to work with my esteemed colleague from the Central Valley to make his dream come true about what high-speed rail can do for the citizens of that wonderful area. So thank you very much for coming today.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Schenk. 2 Director Rossi? 3 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: First Reverend, I'm 70. 4 I left at 4:00 o'clock this morning as well, so I'm right with you, hopefully I'll be with you a long time. 5 But one of the things that I do for the Governor 6 7 is I am the Chairman of the Workforce Investment Board, so when you talk about grants and the efforts that have been 8 9 made I will tell you that we are fully committed to seeing 10 that training takes place. That the opportunities to move 11 the important needle of creation of opportunities for 12 everyone in all communities is uppermost in our minds. 1.3 And I -- as Director Schenk has just said -- I 14 stand shoulder-to-shoulder with Tom Richards to make that 15 happen. And so as I leave this meeting today I will be in 16 the Office of the Department of Labor taking a look at 17 exactly what these numbers really mean and where they are. 18 And I also thank you all for making that trip. 19 And just to let you know, I've got two years on you. 20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All right then, thank you. 21 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: 2.2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Perez-Estolano. 23 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Good morning, everyone. First of all I have -- I again, like my 24 25 colleagues, would like to say thank you for coming and

speaking to us.

2.2

Two things: one, for the way in which you shared your concerns with us. We get yelled at a lot here and it's refreshing and incredibly effective to come and say, "Look, you guys have got to do better." And we're committed to doing better and we will do better. And for me, that's an important powerful message that we will work in collaboration with you. And we -- as my colleague

Mr. Richard said, we are very committed to getting it right and getting it right in Fresno.

And so with that I'd just also like to say please don't make this the last time that you come. We do meet in Fresno and hopefully you will come and visit us when we meet in Fresno and we'll extend that invitation to you. So you can tell us, "You know, you've gotten better or no you still need to get better." Tell us how we're doing, because that's important to me as a small business owner myself. As a DBE and MBE myself it's important to me that we get this right, so thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you all very much. I think it's obvious I should've gotten up at 4:00 in the morning to -- but as you heard from my colleagues there's a heartfelt commitment to working with your community and to bringing the benefits of this project to everybody in California. So thank you and you are certainly welcome to

```
sit in the rest of our meeting, otherwise we wish you safe
 1
 2
    travels. So thank you.
              PUBLIC SPEAKERS: Thank you. Thank you very much.
 3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.
 4
 5
              (Colloquy Between Board Members.)
              Could I just ask what shade of pink is that
 6
 7
    exactly? I think I won't make any further comment.
 8
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: It's a rowdy bunch on this
9
    side.
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We'll give a moment for these
10
11
    fine folks to do the -- Mr. Hartnett, thank you very much.
12
    I apologize for being late this morning.
1.3
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: That's okay, young people
14
    have trouble getting here.
15
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I know, it's a problem.
16
              Yes, hello? I can barely see you down there.
17
    sorry?
18
              (Colloquy Between Board Members.)
19
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Can I just acknowledge that
20
    you're here?
21
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah. Do you want to reopen
2.2
    the roll now that I'm here? Okay. Do you have to do the
23
    whole thing or just call the absentees?
2.4
              MS. NEIBEL: I'd like to call the whole roll --
25
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.
```

```
1
              MS. NEIBEL: -- for the record.
 2
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right.
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?
 3
 4
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Here.
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?
 5
              VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Here.
 6
 7
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Hartnett?
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Here.
 8
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?
 9
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Here.
10
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?
11
12
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Here.
1.3
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?
14
              BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Here.
15
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?
16
              BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Here.
17
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?
18
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Here.
19
              MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?
20
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right, we'll continue
21
    through the public comment period taking comments in the
2.2
    order they were received. Once again, I want to thank Vice
23
    Chair Hartnett and my colleagues for proceeding in my
24
    absence, so that I didn't inconvenience people.
25
              Next up is Frank Oliveira and he'll be followed by
```

Ross Browning and then Diana LaCome.

2.2

2.3

MR. OLIVEIRA: Frank Oliveira from Citizens for California High-Speed Rail Accountability.

On September 28th John Cox from the Bakersfield Californian reported that your staff has known since 2013 that your Tehachapi Mountain route will not work.

Suppressed Authority documents confirm this. You have -- you will have to start over or abandon the project. The lay of that steep grade simply exceeds the maximum tolerances allowed by your technical design requirements.

This is a national transportation infrastructure catastrophe, like the Bay Bridge, that will unfold after you spend approximately \$6 billion pretending to build something in the Central Valley that will not connect to Southern California.

Your Chief Program Manager's sworn statement -court statement reflects the train must go almost down a
3,000-foot elevation drop off the mountains across the
entire Central Valley maintaining 200 mile -- 220 miles per
hour to meet the legally-mandated requirement of less than 2
hours and 40 minutes. Not a problem for a garbage in,
garbage out computer model, but there is no steel rail on
steel wheel train available today that can maintain 220 mile
an hour climb up the Tehachapis. And there is no braking
system that would make it safe to go down the Tehachapis at

220 miles an hour.

1.3

2.2

2.3

Proposition 1A requires your funding plan certify completed EIRs for the entire operating segment before asking for an appropriation in order to protect the public's investment from the problems like this after the fact.

Complying with that requirement would have revealed the problem and forced appropriate mitigations in the routing and obviously affected EIRs north and south of the mountains. You failed to tell the legislature that you knew your plan would not work when you requested the Prop 1A billions; that they would not have appropriated the money for you if you had. We believe the Supreme Court will see this.

Why was the contract to the consultant that prepared these suppressed documents not renewed? Were they canned for not pretending for you? Why did your staff delay releasing these documents for months after they were requested? This looks like a cover-up, smells like a cover-up, and it is a cover-up. Will the State Attorney General investigate this cover-up? Does the Governor realize that you have known, at the latest 2013, that his legacy project will not work and will make him an international fool?

Billions of dollars, ARRA dollars, are being used in this pretend project. Will the US Attorney General investigate this cover-up? Have you told the US Department

of Transportation about this? What will Congress say? 1 2 We challenge you here today, point us to the breaking system 3 that will slow your pretend train down as it falls off the mountains at 220. We demand a full public presentation on 4 5 all of these issues at your next Board meeting. Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Oliveira. 7 Ross Browning, followed by Diana LaCome and then Paul Guerrero. 8 9 MR. BROWNING: Yes, good morning. My name is Ross 10 Browning, also from CCHSRA, the Laton Division. CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Laton Division? 11 12 MR. BROWNING: Yeah, we -- I had to say something, I'm tired of saying Laton. 13 14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah. 15 MR. BROWNING: I would like to make some comments on comments that Mr. Morales made that were in this Fresno 16 17 Bee that a -- a Mr. Michael Seti had written in. I have not 18 read Mr. Seti's article or know what he says, but I'm just 19 concerned or interested in some things that Mr. Morales 20 said. I'm going to do a little cherry-picking here, but you 21 guys know what that is, because you do it to us all the 2.2 time. 2.3 You said, Mr. Morales, that the voters and the 24 legislature, actually the legislature and the voters, 25 decided the the route of the high-speed rail system, not

some nefarious strategy hatched up the California High-Speed Rail Authority.

2.2

2.3

2.4

Only part of that statement is true. The voters did not decide a route. They approved a route that the legislature gave us. I -- I don't recall ever having anybody say, "Do you want to A or B or C or all of them or none of them?" Didn't happen that way. You've got the train going to Modesto here, but that's not in Prop 1A. I guess we -- we gain little things as we go along.

I'm going to touch on something in here. You talk about 220 miles an hour, and that's a 110 miles an hour he advocates. I don't know where he's getting his number from, but as far as I know there has been no proof that you have any train or that anything will operate at 220 miles on the system that you've -- you've designed or that you're coming up with.

And, last but not least, you mention here enough demand to generate net operating cash flows. There's Mr. Rossi and I've sat through two meetings where Mr. Rossi came totally unglued when somebody said "net operating profit, net operating cash flow." He says it is an operating cash flow, not a net operating cash flow. Thank you, very much.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Browning.

MS. LACOME: Can you hear me now?

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. 2 MS. LACOME: Yes, okay. 3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, Ms. LaCome. MS. LACOME: Yes, good morning Chairman Richard, 4 5 CEO Morales and Board members. I have two items that I would like to discuss with you. 6 7 First, one is I was just reading that you are seeking train set manufacturers. And this is all well and 8 9 good, but I do hope that you keep your commitment about building these trains here in California. As you saw from 10 11 the previous speakers it is very much needed, especially in 12 Central California. You state in your press release that you're 1.3 14 already looking for land for the facilities, maintenance and 15 so on, for the heavy duty and the light and so on. there's no mention at all about the manufacturing plants, so 16 17 I would just like to bring that to your attention and 18 hopefully we'll move in that direction. 19 The second item is a dispute resolution board. 20 Now that we're into construction there are disputes, 21 construction disputes on a daily basis. The large 2.2 contractors have a dispute resolution board, but the small 2.3 business do not. 24 So I think that with your supportive services 25 contract, or either separately, that the Authority should

```
1
    look into developing a DRB for small business. And that
 2
    this would be -- actually all small businesses would be
    notified that this would be available for their use at no
 3
    cost, because usually what'll happen is that they have to go
 4
    to court. Litigation is very expensive and this is
 5
    something that the Authority can do to help the small
 6
 7
    business. Thank you.
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. LaCome. We will
 8
9
    take a look at that suggestion.
              Paul Guerrero?
10
11
              MR. GUERRERO: Good morning. Good morning.
12
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.
13
              MR. GUERRERO: On behalf of LaRaza Round Table I
14
    want to compliment Jeff Morales on his presentation at our
15
    last LaRaza Round Table meeting. We were very impressed by
    the fact that he rode the train from Sacramento to San Jose;
16
17
    he really walks the talk.
18
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Or rides the ride, I guess we
19
    could say.
20
              MR. GUERRERO: Or rides the ride, yes.
21
              At our last -- at our board meeting, at that
2.2
    meeting we discussed getting the word out about
2.3
    opportunities for small businesses to participate in
    construction and purchasing on the high-speed rail.
24
25
              And I believe you have a handout there that is a
```

copy of what DGS puts out and it starts on the first page with asphalt and it ends on the last page with pudding. And these are the products that they have out to purchase and this is updated monthly. So you get this list you know what's coming up. This thing goes all the way up into 2015, I believe, on some of these projects. You have February 2015 for beverages.

2.2

So what I suggest is that High-Speed Rail look at adopting something like this. And if you do we'll commit to getting this thing out statewide for you. I mean, we have an email process set up ourselves that we can get this out statewide to the bulk of the major organizations and then they can get it out to their members. So I really hope you take a look at that and maybe produce something similar. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Guerrero.

The next comment is from Robert Allen and then the final speaker this morning will be Marvin Dean. Good morning, Bob.

MR. ALLEN: Fifteen years ago, Amtrak hit a steel-loaded truck at Bourbonnais, Illinois. And it had this derailment which I have showed and I've passed it out to you before. Blended rail that you have violates the very premise of Proposition 1A in 2008 that high-speed rail would be safe and reliable.

We fence our 65-mile-an-hour freeways against intrusion, against cross-traffic. Caltrain runs 79 miles an hour past station platforms, across dozens of cross-streets and you talk of raising that in the Caltrain area to 125 miles an hour? It's a recipe for disaster far worse than this Bourbonnais derailment that killed 11 people and injured 128, derailed two heavy locomotives, derailed 11 -- 14 cars.

To meet that safe and reliable premise of

Proposition 1A high-speed rail needs to -- a secure track

fenced and grade separated. Initial high-speed rail to the

Bay Area should end at San Jose with a nearly seamless

transfer there to Caltrain, Capitol Corridor, VTA Light Rail

and the (inaudible) Silicon Valley BART.

I urge you squander no more high-speed rail funds on Caltrain electrification or extension. High-speed trains on those tracks would be vulnerable to devastating mishap, to accidents and purposeful suicide. So I urge you to rephrase the -- the plans that you have. That you phase high-speed rail to the Bay Area simply to San Jose for the time being, later up the Amtrak line to Oakland and Sacramento. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Allen.

Mr. Dean?

2.2

2.3

2.4

MR. DEAN: Good evening or should I say good

morning? I left at 3:00 o'clock this morning and I haven't got any sleep since last night, so bear with me.

2.2

2.3

I just want to make a few remarks on a few things. First of all, I want to thank the Board for all of you -- what you've done to this point in terms of small business and DBE commitment.

I want to thank the Fresno community for coming up here. I'm a part of that group as well and I asked that they come down here and present their views, because a lot of these issues we've been raising for some time. But I could tell you throughout the Central Valley -- and that's where we're targeting -- the reason I didn't want to take their time to get the buses and get back. I'm from Bakersfield. Our target area is from Bakersfield to Stockton and we're looking at those environmental justice committees along the right-of-way.

And we've got other members along the right-of-way have the same issues. We could have brought folks in here from Corcoran. We could have brought folks in here from Stockton. We could have brought folks in from Bakersfield, but the issues are the same. But the project that's down zero -- is ground zero is Fresno.

And I want to say that what I hope got clear was they support the project. All of us support the project. We know that -- I know that the biggest challenge this Board

has is getting this project built and still some doubts as to what's -- what's going to happen with that, so that's your number-one challenge. And I know that you're sensitive to small business.

2.2

But those us of that are concerned about this, we can also step up and be a part of the solution by working with us, and we feel that we've been kind of underutilized in terms of what we can bring to the table. As an example, the unions play an important role, but they can't touch most of those communities. A lot of the folks are going to have to get job-ready. They can't -- if they're ready to -- got all their requirements and they step up in the unions then they'll get those programs. But a lot of these people in these environmental justice communities, if we don't address that problem and deal with some of the barriers, they're not going to be involved in this process.

And that's all we're trying to do is cry out and say that we want to be included and we want to come up with some recommendations. And I've asked for a meeting with Jeff. And I apologize Jeff, but my schedule's been crazy. I know I've supposed to have met a couple of times and we're going to try to pin it down before I leave. And we're going to come up with some recommendations of what we can probably do to help.

But the -- I guess what I wanted to just say I

wanted to say that we're grateful for what you guys have done. And we want to just partner with you, so that we can do what we need to do to make sure that everybody's going to be included. And I guess that's really what I just came to say to you.

2.2

2.3

And that our concern is again, these environmental justice communities along the route. And that's why I proposed some time ago about looking at the Century Freeway model. But -- and we talked about those impacts out there. What are we going to do for remedies? And we're going to come up with some recommendations as to what we think that might work, some smart things that might be able to help to get some of our people ready.

And that what we're focusing on again, is these routes along the environmental justice communities along the Central Valley. Because right now what's in place is good, but it's not hitting the target to address a lot of these people that came here today. And we want to come up with some recommendations and to partner with you.

So thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Dean. And thank you for your work on this.

Okay. With that we have completed the public comment section, and I think it's --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible)

```
1
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. So we'll move on to the
 2
    regular portion of the agenda, so the first thing is -- I'm
    sorry my --
 3
 4
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's the minutes.
 5
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah, I know. I know it's the
 6
    minutes. I just wanted to get my --
 7
              Okay. I'll entertain a motion to move by Director
    Rossi directed by Director Schenk. Could the secretary
8
9
    please call the roll?
10
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?
11
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.
12
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?
1.3
              VICE CHAIR RICHARDS:
14
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Hartnett?
15
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Abstain.
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?
16
17
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?
18
19
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.
20
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?
21
              BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.
2.2
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?
2.3
              BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Yes.
2.4
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?
25
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.
```

MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard? 1 2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. 3 We expect to see Chair Lowenthal any minute here, 4 so we'll just proceed through this until she arrives and so we'll skip over item two for now. 5 Let me just take one moment just for house-keeping 6 matters. We had talked about $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$ at some point after that I 7 know that Director Frank has to leave this morning around 8 9 11:00; is that right? 10 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: That's right. CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. So what I'd like to 11 12 propose is that after Ms. Lowenthal's presentation that we -- so hold on one second, let me just check. 13 14 (Colloquy between Board Members.) 15 All right, so I think we'll just proceed through the agenda then as normal. Some of the issues that we had 16 17 have been overtaken. Okay. So we'll do that. 18 All right, so item three, consideration of 19 delegation of authority to the CEO to review and certify 20 proposed advertising displays. BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved. 21 2.2 VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Second. 23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It's been moved by Director It's been seconded by Vice Chair Hartnett. It's 24 Rossi. 25 been noted that Ms. Boehm is standing at the podium with

```
1
    nothing to do.
 2
              Will the Secretary please call the roll?
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?
 3
 4
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.
 5
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?
              VICE CHAIR RICHARDS:
 6
 7
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Hartnett?
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Yes.
 8
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?
9
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.
10
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?
11
12
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.
1.3
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?
14
              BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.
15
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?
16
              BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Yes.
17
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.
18
19
              MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?
20
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: And I just want to remark it
21
22
   was an excellent written report that was totally self-
   sufficient.
2.3
24
              UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Totally self-sufficient, nice
25
    work.
```

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah, I was about to say the same thing. Thank you, Mr. Hartnett.

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you.

2.2

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. We'll move on to the next item, which is item four, consideration of an amendment to the Nossaman, LLP contract for time and budget.

And Mr. Fellenz, good Morning.

MR. FELLENZ: Yes, Chairman Richard and Board members, this item is to ask for an amendment for time and money to the Nossaman contract.

I just want to give you a little bit of background about the legal services that we're using at High-Speed Rail. We have five members of the legal team who work directly for High-Speed Rail, who are state employees. And all litigation that occurs within the High-Speed Rail Authority, as with most state agencies, is we use the Attorney General's Office to represent us. It's required under statute that we use the Attorney General's Office.

If they can't provide those services then we ask them to give us permission to go to private counsel to provide those services. There's a couple circumstances where they may not be able to provide the services. That would include a lack of expertise in a particular subject matter area or lack of staff to perform the work, because of the magnitude or volume of the work.

So all of our litigation, almost 100 percent, has been handled by the Attorney General's Office and that's in the areas in funding and environmental litigation that we've seen.

2.2

2.3

We also have an inter-agency contract with the Department of Transportation within the state system. They're experts in the property acquisition arena and we have this agent -- we have an inter-agency agreement that they will provide all the real property legal advice necessary for us to go through the property acquisition process, including any litigation that might come from that process.

We also have an inter-agency contract with the Department of General Services. They're the experts in goods and services contracts. We rely on them to provide us with legal advice and guidance in those particular areas.

Since 2011, the Nossaman law firm has been providing us legal services in a few particular areas that we didn't have in-house counsel for. And we asked the Attorney General's office for those services and they could not provide them as well. The reasons were that they didn't have the expertise.

The area that we have the most work being done by Nossaman is in the area of design-build procurement. It's a particular type of procurement, different from that the

Department of General Services provides. And for the most part the state civil infrastructure systems have been designed and built through a design-build -- design-bid-build process, not a design-build process. Caltrans has a very limited amount of experience in that area, very small, only ten projects in its history. And so we asked the Attorney General's office for that expertise. They were unable to provide it, so we engaged with the Nossaman firm.

2.2

2.3

Another area that they have provided legal services for us in is the environmental permitting area, which are both state and federal environmental permits.

Each environmental section is required to obtain a number of permits for protection of resources and those permits are very voluminous. We engage with the permit issuing department or agency at the federal and state level and there's a lot of legal work to be done in that arena.

They also have provided us with legal services for surface transportation petitions. An activity that we've had with the Surface Transportation Board where the Surface Transportation Board, as you recall, in 2013 has taken over jurisdiction over our project. And therefore we are required to ask their permission to construct.

And finally, we have gone through some train set procurements. Again, we asked the Attorney General's Office. They didn't have the expertise in that type of

procurement nor the resources and so Nossaman performed those services as well.

1.3

2.2

2.3

The current contracts have the 30 percent small business goal and we have amended the contract. And we have attached, for your reference, the couple of Board resolutions from the 2012 and 2013 where we've augmented the amount of money for this contract. And what we're asking for is an extension of this contract to 2017 and an additional \$10 million of funds.

And I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. An item definitely not on the consent agenda.

Ms. Schenk, why don't we start with you?

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And this is no surprise to Mr. Fellenz in his excellent pre-meeting briefing. We had this conversation. And let me just say at the outset I have the highest regard for the Nossaman firm and the work that they've done over the years for us and for other state agencies.

But, you know, despite that high regard we have fiduciary and other duties here to make sure that every public dollar is well spent and well reviewed no matter what the source of that public funding, whether its bond money or tax payer money etc. And so it's my view that thing have

changed since 2011. You know, we were really very understaffed. We just needed all kinds of help. And we still do need outside consulting help, but I do think that this is a good opportunity rather than just for, I think now the third time to extend this contract. And \$12 million, you know, like Everett Dirksen said, "A million here, a million there, pretty soon we're talking real money." That we take a sharp-keyed look at the legal services and while they have expertise other firms have this expertise.

2.2

And it wasn't familiar that they have train set procurement expertise particularly, so we're paying for them to acquire this expertise. And while I understand that there is some training of state lawyers involved in the contract, still we're paying them to develop a lot of expertise. And maybe there's a new way of looking at this, as you and I discussed. You know, law firms now do things on a project basis. You deliver this for X amount of dollars rather than the traditional billable hour. Here's a budget and you just bill against that. We've got to take a more sharp-eyed look. Maybe it is time to take a competitive look to see what is out there and who is out there that can do the work maybe for less money. There are certainly a lot of very good firms.

So I don't think that -- that right now I'm comfortable just loading "yea" on an extension of the

1 contract, because we've now reached our limit of what we had 2 approved in the prior amendment. 3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Schenk. Director Frank? 4 5 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. share a number of Director Schenk's concerns and I have a 6 7 couple of others. As I understand it --8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Could you pull your mic a 9 10 little closer, thanks? BOARD MEMBER FRANK: As I understand it this 11 12 contract first came up in 2011 and the proposal was to issue a contract to Nossaman for \$1.2 million, a year later an 13 14 augmentation to 5.9 million, a year later 14.5 million. And 15 now the request is to take the contract to \$27 million, which is a fairly breathtaking figure at least to me. 16 17 I fully understand the need to retain outside 18 counsel for certain specialized work. And as Mr. Fellenz has mentioned the utilization of the Nossaman firm, and 19 20 their expertise with respect to the Board's and the 21 Authority's interaction with the Surface Transportation 2.2 Board in Washington D.C., I think makes a lot of sense. 2.3 But I also see in the report, a request to hire Nossaman for such things as strategic planning legal advice 24 25 and environmental permitting legal support. And it seems to

me that those are -- are skills that we either have in-house or in state service or we need to develop and develop quickly. There's a provision in the California Government Code Section 11040, in which the legislature states, "It is the intent of the legislature that overall efficiency and economy in state government be enhanced by employment of the Attorney General as counsel for the representation of state agencies and employees in judicial and other proceedings."

2.2

And it seems to me as we develop a long-term plan for provision of cost-effective and superior legal services, that our priority ought to be developing that expertise and utilizing that expertise either from our in-house counsel, from the Attorney General's Office, or from other state agencies where that expertise may already exist or could quickly be developed such as the Department of Transportation. So again, I -- I have concerns that over the long term that we may be heading down a troublesome path. And again, given our fiduciary duty I'd like to encourage my colleagues on the Board to revisit this issue in terms of how our long-term legal needs should be addressed.

And the last thing I want to do, and see is our very talented in-house legal staff be consumed with managing outside counsel contracts, which I don't think could be the best use of their time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Perez-Estolano?

BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: To echo some of the concerns that some of my colleagues have mentioned I also have concerns. One -- and when you briefed us last week I appreciated you going through some of these issues, but then I was able to kind of go through my materials and say, you know, there's some questions I have.

Tom?

2.2

VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Uh-huh?

BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: 2017 is a -- you know, two and change years out and that seems like an extensive extension to me in terms a contract of this scale.

I appreciate my colleague, Mr. Frank, outlining the kind of succession of the cumulative cost or in terms of the contract extensions just the adding up of those things.

And for me, I think it's important to have that transparency. It's not consistent in the Board reports. There's one report that basically does add the cumulative piece, but I would like to have it on all of our -- because its very difficult to kind of keep track of like, "Okay. Where are we with these costs?" And so we started out with 1.9. We went up to 5.9. But, I mean, so -- so if we could just have an understanding of where we are with this particular issue, where the legal services cost, so that we can understand.

That's related to another issue that came up in our briefing with Mr. Hartnett, which is I would like an overall review of where we are with our funding strategy as a separate issue that I'd like to bring up as a -- as a member later on. But to me, it's having some consistency in terms of a sharing with the Board, "This is where we started, this is where we've been, this is where we'd like to go," in terms of these cumulative costs. Because it -- it is -- I mean I'm trying to add them up on the back of a sheet here. And it would be helpful, and I think helpful to the public, to know where are in terms of cumulative costs.

2.2

But I agree with both Rick and Lynn that -- that we need to probably take a better look at this in terms of how we're executing this particular contract.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Other comments?
Mr. Hartnett, Director Hartnett?

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Yeah. I appreciate the points raised by my colleagues. I don't have the same global concerns, but I think the individual points brought up are certainly of interest to the entire Board and to the efficient provision of legal services.

The outside role that the Nossaman firm provides is absolutely critical, in my evaluation, to the success of properly moving forward on the legal front with respect to the number of -- number of the areas that have been

identified as to the scope of their services. Less important is the strategic planning legal advice and, you know, there's a couple of others that are not as important.

2.2

2.3

But I certainly don't want to be pennywise or pound foolish. And I understand that Mr. Fellenz, you have plans ongoing to request additional bodies in the Legal Department, both so as to manage outside attorneys as well as to do more in-house. Perhaps you could provide a little more information on that to the Board, now in terms of how you foresee the Department evolving? And how outside services such as the Nossaman firm are integrated into your plans for the legal department.

MR. FELLENZ: Sure, I'd be happy to do that.

Right now, we have a request for two additional attorney positions that goes through the Department of Finance. And so that would be for the next fiscal year starting in July 1st, 2015. So that would bring a total of seven attorneys in-house, including myself.

We also have had conversations with the Transportation Agency about the issues that this Board's bringing up, which is not just only in the legal area, but also in engineering and other disciplines that we have a need for. What other state departments or agencies have that type of expertise and how can the High-Speed Rail Authority tap into those to keep costs down? To use the

expertise that's sometimes very particular to state activities and functions like we have?

2.2

And, for example, Caltrans -- having worked there for a long time myself -- they have the contracts and activities through building civil infrastructure that's very similar to ours. And there's a lot of people at Caltrans that have that kind of -- could help us out quite a bit.

And also, Caltrans funding is changing. And in fact, it's becoming a -- it's shrinking, because of the exhaustion of some bond funds that were available for some period of time under Proposition 1A and from some ARRA funds that Caltrans had received from the federal government, which are near exhaustion. And so there's an opportunity, I think, maybe to shift some of those resources that wouldn't be needed at Caltrans over to the High-Speed Rail Authority where we're really ramping up.

And that can be done in a variety of ways. I think as Jeff -- Jeff's vision, and I think this Board's vision, is to have a smaller state staff at the High-Speed Rail Authority, compared to some other State agencies. For example, Caltrans has 20,000 state employees. We have about 150 at this point. We're going to transition from a largely public sector effort of developing the high-speed train system and then shifting over to the private sector, which would be operating that system. So we don't want to become

too large that we can't segue into that other phase of our project. And so to the extent that we can tap into some resources that either fade out with some other state agencies, with inter-agency agreements, I think it can be very beneficial for us.

2.2

2.3

So we're having those discussions. And for the legal services I will be looking to Caltrans to see if there's other areas that we can use to provide those legal services that the Attorney General can't provide. Another state agency is the Department of Water Resources. They do civil infrastructure building and so that's another source.

And so we're looking at that. I think there is going to be those opportunities we'll take advantage of.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I think in light of that, Vice Chair Hartnett, just in a sidebar, made a suggestion that I think makes sense. Which is that given the policy direction from the Board, which is to -- or the sentiment of the Board in expressing policy on this I think it probably makes sense to take a step back, Mr. Fellenz, and maybe come back at the next meeting with a revised plan. Let's look at an absolutely minimalist approach to outside counsel to see really, after looking and scrubbing, what services are absolutely specialized services -- and number one.

Number two, it sounds as though even beyond that if there are specialized services, and I know this will come

up later today, but Mr. Morales has had a -- put us on a course that I think is a very good one, which is that where we need to for continuity's sake to extend the contract, say for time, we will do that. But otherwise. we will look to refresh our processes through competitive bidding. And even those contractors who have performed brilliantly for the High-Speed Rail Authority, over time everybody needs to take a step back and -- and kind of sharpen their pencils and come back again. So I think it's the sense of the Board that I'm hearing, to ask you to revise the plan. To really distill down the absolute necessity for any of those services that are required outside of what is available, both through the Attorney General's Office and through the rest of state government. And then to lay out for us, a path of resolicitation for any remaining services. And I'm not saying that that needs to be an absolute cut-off, but some type of transition to both a focus on in-house as well as a resolicitation for any services we would need outside. If that reflects the view of the Board --BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, I'm sorry. I have one more question? CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, Ms. Schenk, please. BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: It does -- it does, but I just have a -- how close are we to reaching the existing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

```
1
    cap? Do you need some extension between now and the next
 2
    meeting, so that we don't interrupt unwittingly what's going
 3
    on and what is necessary?
              MR. FELLENZ: We have enough money to go to the
 4
 5
    next meeting, yes. And I think that the funds will be
    exhausted probably by the end of January.
 6
 7
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Okay.
              MR. FELLENZ: And even though the term extended
 8
9
    out to June one of the reasons for the different -- for the
    term -- the exhaustion of the funds before the term ends was
10
11
    because of some of the train set procurement that we had
12
    engaged in, particularly the Amtrak. And now we're going
1.3
    with a separate procurement on that, so -- so we used some
14
    of the funds up.
15
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Maybe we can borrow some of
16
    those Amtrak lawyers who do have train procurement
17
    experience?
18
              MR. FELLENZ: Right, right, right, right.
19
    we'll good through January, I believe.
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Okay.
2.0
                                            Thank you.
2.1
              MR. FELLENZ: All right, thanks.
2.2
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Mr. Chairman?
2.3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, Director Rossi?
24
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I would only observe this.
25
    We need to be careful here that we act as a Board and not
```

try and create the management structure for this Authority. And also, I think we need to be very careful here to assume that since something has always been done some -- in a certain way in state government that it's the best way to do it -- probably an oxymoron.

2.2

2.3

I mean, at some stage we need to be willing to be comfortable that if management thinks they need outside counsel then we need to deal with that issue. If we aren't comfortable that management understands what they're doing, then we ought to have a different set of conversations. And I just want to urge the Board to be very careful here about, "My past experience is we -- this is the way it's done and here it is." Past experience is not necessarily what you look to for the future.

And if we're going to run this operation in a manner that is reflective of the most economic, efficient and robust program that we can do for the citizens of the State of California we need to be very comfortable about two things. We're a Board, we don't run the place. Two, because it's always been done some other way that isn't necessarily the best way to do it tomorrow.

And I just want to be sure we're very careful here about what we do as a Board.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, let me just comment on that. I know others may -- Mr. Frank cited for us a state

statute. And I think our responsibility is a Board, among other things, is to make sure that we're complying with the letter and the spirit of state statutes. And so if the state statute says that it's the legislature's wisdom that the assumption is that legal services should be provided to the greatest extent possible by the Attorney General's Office then that needs to be our starting point.

2.2

After that, I agree with you. We need to look at that and say, "Okay. If there are limits to what those resources can provide we also have the responsibilities under the Bond Act, and under other statutes, to deliver this project. And so then I think that our responsibilities as Board members kick in to make those judgments as well.

But in trying to condense what I thought I was hearing from my colleagues, my starting point was where Mr. Frank started, which is if the legislature has spoken on this issue, then we need to be respectful of that. That's our starting point. And then to really make sure that we can say we took a hard look at that.

That doesn't mean that we automatically say that all these services must be provided by the Attorney

General's Office, but that we don't just -- and I would also say, Mr. Rossi, I think the problem is that as was pointed out, we've been continuing to do things the same way with the same firm and now we're up to \$27 dollars. I think it

```
1
    just makes sense to take a pause and ask the question --
 2
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Different issue,
 3
    Mr. Chairman. I'm not suggesting that the process, as
    raised by Lynn and by Rick, that we ought to be sure we know
 4
    exactly what we're doing for the dollars that we spending.
 5
    That's a different issue.
 6
 7
              What I'm suggesting is that we want to be -- yes,
    the legislature says lots of things. I assume that this
 8
9
    management team has looked at that and have decided that
10
    they need this other expertise. I also assume they will
11
    understand what they need to build a legal department that
12
    is reflective of the things they need to do.
13
              And I'm just cautioning all of us that we need to
14
    be very careful as to where our roles end and their roles
15
    begin.
16
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Mr. Chairman, if I may --
17
    that to Mr. Rossi's point?
18
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Actually, if I could just ask
19
    you to hold one second?
20
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Sure.
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I jumped in before Vice Chair
21
22
    Hartnett was about to say something, so let me just turn to
23
    him first and then back to you, Ms. Schenk.
24
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you. Just a couple of
25
    points. First, Mr. Chair, that the summary that you made as
```

you read as the general direction of the Board does not include me. But I -- it may include a majority of the Board, but I want to be clear that -- that I don't necessarily buy into that overall policy that you articulated.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Secondly, I do agree with

2.2

2.4

Mr. Rossi in terms of his global view of this. And I would like to see -- and I think it's consistent with what perhaps the majority of the Board is looking for is not necessarily a revised proposal, but a more flavorful report that sets forth in a little more detail what it is that management is recommending to us and why. That will also, perhaps answer some of the questions that were raised today. I think there are answers to those questions.

And I think the context is, as well, that the existing agreement can be terminated by the Authority on 30-days' notice. And so as we extend this if we do, it doesn't bind us to living with that party. And so I think you have to, to some extent, justify what your recommendation is and be clearer on why you're recommending what you are.

But I'm not looking for a different report in terms of your strategic objectives, personally.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Ms. Schenk?

BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Thank you. Well, all right

I'm almost your age, Mike, so -- And having spent a whole lot of those years in the state government as a cabinet secretary, which Caltrans was one of my departments, and then as Chief of Staff to the Governor let me say that it is a well-established traditional model for agencies to come and ask for outside counsel. And Jeff, I know when you were at Caltrans you know this. And what -- and we need the expertise that is not in-house and we want to make sure that as much is done in the private sector as possible.

2.2

But what has happened over the years is we have this model of going to outside counsel, entering into these contracts with outside counsel, and then there is a relationship that naturally develops between the in-house staff and the outside counsel. And pretty soon, things that can be done in-house whether in the AGs office or internal Caltrans or whatever it's just easier, "Well, let's just ask outside counsel to do this." And pretty soon it just bleeds out and that has been the traditional model. This is not something new that hasn't been done before.

And I'm just saying that we need to really bring it back, as our Chairman says, and -- and take a very sharp look at this at where do we really need outside expertise? Where do we need to develop in-house expertise, because we're going to need it in the long run and it is cheaper to do it inside rather than outside.

So that has been the model in the past. Now, maybe it's time to look at a new model. CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Let me -- let me --BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Chairman, I'd like to add one more comment? CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Just very briefly I just want to be on the record I support our leadership and our management here in terms of how they think about the way in which we're using public funds. And it's just up to us 11 to determine, you know, and question. And so I don't think, what I've seen from this Board, us trying to micromanage. I think we have extended to the CEO and to his team as much as 14 we can to say, "We have confidence, go forward, move forward. Don't, you know -- we have faith that you're going to make the best decisions on behalf of this project and 16 behalf of the state. So I don't think that that's what we're saying. I think that, you know, for me just personally going to 2017 is an extensive period of time. The amount of funds are extensive. And I just think that we can be --2.2 it's a competitive market and I think that this is an 23 opportunity for us to get the best and most suited team to

assist us in what we're doing. So I -- for me the message

is not questioning the management. It's just saying, "I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

56

```
1
    think I'd like to drill down on this a little bit more."
 2
    That's all, Mike.
               CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. So what I'm going to
 3
 4
    suggest is this, Mr. Fellenz, that different Board members
 5
    have different issues on this. I did my best to try to see
    if I could wrap them all in, but I obviously was not able to
 6
 7
    do that adequately and that's fine.
              Members what I would suggest is that Mr. Fellenz
 8
    take a step back from this, have an opportunity to reach out
9
    and discuss with members what their particular policy --
10
11
    policy concerns are. And then come back to us with a plan
12
    that addresses those at the next meeting.
13
              And let me just say to the public that what I'm
14
    saying here is not that the Board is going to make this
15
    decision outside of public view. What I'm suggesting is
    that there be an opportunity for Mr. Fellenz to reach to
16
17
    individual Board members, not any type of collective
18
    decision. We will then consider that in a public meeting at
19
    our next meeting and the Board will express its policy views
20
    at that time.
21
              MR. FELLENZ: Yep, I'm happy to do that.
2.2
    you.
2.3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.
24
              VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Mr. Chairman, if I may just
25
    for a moment?
```

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes?

2.2

2.3

VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Just so I say it in public.

I have agreed pretty much with most of what I've heard this morning.

One of the things that is of interest to me would be for you to -- I'd like to understand, not today but maybe next meeting or if we talk in the interim, why are we better served with going out of house for counsel with a single firm, as opposed to going to whichever firm happens to be best able to handle legal counsel for us, in whatever the issue may be at the time? I'm sure there must be some management and administrative issues with that, but I'm just -- I'm concerned about why a single firm is best able to do all the things that we may need to have done, okay? And how that decision be being made when we do go out of house.

I assume quite often for litigation, but I'm also concerned, I think, with some of the things that the other colleagues have mentioned with regards to how do we determine do we really need outside counsel for certain things as opposed to handling those in a different way that may be more cost-effective for the taxpayers. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

MR. FELLENZ: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Fellenz, thanks. And I appreciate the fact that a lot of work went into this, but

we'll ask you to do a little bit more.

2.2

2.4

So, okay with that I'm going to then go back to item two. We've had some commentary in the last few minutes about the wisdom of the California legislature and its work. We have an opportunity to express those views in a different way right now, but taking a moment to honor the work of retiring Chair of the Assembly Committee on Transportation, the Honorable Bonnie Lowenthal. And I'm delighted that she's here with us this morning. I want to thank you for coming.

I'm also delighted that you're accompanied by the Committee's Chief Consultant, Ms. Dawson, who I want to say two things about. She's been incredibly helpful to us.

And the other thing, Chair Lowenthal, is that I've come to learn over the last three years that there were a number of things that Ms. Dawson recommended that this Authority do in past years that it didn't do that it should have done, that it's now trying to catch up to do, so we should've listened to her back then.

So you were well served by Ms. Dawson. And as a consequence we -- we have been very, very grateful for your leadership, not just on this project, but in general for the people of California as we build transportation systems for the future.

And with that I'd like to turn to our CEO

Mr. Morales, who I know has worked very, very closely with you and the Committee and ask him to make a few remarks.

2.2

VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Should we ask him to step up, please?

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And then certainly we'd like to invite you to come up.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Chairwoman Lowenthal, thank you.

You know, I think we all know big things don't happen without leadership. And we have been very fortunate, not just this organization but I think the state as a whole, very fortunate to have Bonnie Lowenthal as Chair of the Transportation Committee over the last few years. When it comes to our issue, our program, she's had a steady conviction about what this can mean for the state and has always kept things -- kept that focus, I think, as we've dealt with some of the short-term issues going through.

You know, and it's very important to note that her support for high-speed rail did not mean that she automatically supported everything we did or, you know, would propose to do. And, you know, we've been held accountable. We've been pushed in different directions, but always again with the long-term picture in mind. And I think that's a quality in political leadership that isn't always there. But I think, you know, again Chairwoman

Lowenthal has been consistent in that and never lost sight of what the big picture was.

2.2

And on behalf of the staff and all of those who worked with her, with the Committee, with Janet, I want to express our appreciation for that and for the ability to work constructively with you. And I think we are moving forward in no small part, because of the leadership provided by Ms. Lowenthal and through her Committee leadership.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Morales.

We do have a resolution commemorating your work and expressing our thanks. I don't think I'm going to ask for a roll call on that. I'm going to assume that it is passed by acclimation by the Board.

And Chair Lowenthal, welcome to our proceedings this morning. We're grateful that you're here, so we'd love to hear any remarks that you would have.

CHAIR LOWENTHAL: Well, first of all thank you so much Mr. Chair and Jeff and the Board, the Authority.

It has been a bumpy road over my five years as Chair of Transportation, but frankly from the moment I came into the legislature I was a fan. And as a fan I wanted to see the project move forward despite the bumps in the road, despite the same people coming and objecting, for all the reasons that you know, to the project.

I think your words were the most important, "long

```
term." You know, this was not something that ever needed to
 1
 2
    stop, because of a hiccup. And I so I commend you for
 3
    staying on course. I will always be an advocate, but like
    any other project it's two steps forward and one step back.
 4
    But under your leadership I think we're making great strides
 5
    and you will continue along the way. And even though I'm
 6
 7
    out of the legislature in another month and a half -- but
    who's counting -- I will be there to support the project and
 8
9
    to work in Southern California to the best of my ability.
10
              So I wish you continued success, it is a success.
11
    It's been difficult. I'm glad we nabbed some of that East
12
    Coast money and good for us that they decided not to build
13
    and I hope it continues. Thank you so much.
14
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. And I'd like to
15
    take a moment and just thank you very much for your work.
16
              CHAIR LOWENTHAL: Thank you.
17
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We have a resolution. If I can
18
    just take a moment, we're going to hand it to you.
19
               (Colloguy Between Board Members)
20
              Okay. Thank you, colleagues.
21
              CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Mr. Chairman,
2.2
    for the next item --
2.3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Item five?
              CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- Item five we
24
25
    can -- given the past performance we can ask if Ms. Boehm
```

```
1
    needs to stand up or not. I will be happy to present as the
    Board sees fit.
 3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Does the Board have questions?
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I have one question.
 4
 5
    fact that we do it in two -- sorry, the fact that we do it
    in two is not -- is insignificant, I just want to be sure
 6
 7
    about that.
              CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: It's
 8
9
    insignificant. The splitting is insignificant, and in fact,
    we believe it can be more efficient --
10
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Perfect.
11
12
              CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- because one
    of the issues with the longer segment would have been --
13
14
    meant that we could not move forward on a piece until we had
15
    all of the issues resolved. So we think this is actually a
    more efficient way or proceeding.
16
17
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Perfect.
18
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I think we had that discussion
19
    a couple of meetings ago. I'm not sure if you weren't
20
    paying attention?
21
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I was -- I was not there,
2.2
    good call.
2.3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right, I believe it's --
2.4
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved.
25
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- been moved by Mr. Rossi,
```

```
1
    seconded by -- did any of the members?
 2
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Second.
 3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Seconded by Ms. Schenk.
     Did any other members have questions on this? Are we
 4
    comfortable moving forward?
 5
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Yeah.
                                            I -- I just want to
 6
 7
    comment again that the written report was very good. And
    the lack of the need for oral presentation is a good sign,
 8
9
    not a bad sign other than I don't mean to say anything about
10
    the legal presentation, because lawyers always -- always
11
    create controversy. And so that -- that's a good thing, but
12
    I think it was a very good written report.
1.3
              MS. BOEHM: And yeah, I do --
14
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And Tom get's paid by the hour.
15
              Ms. Perez-Estolano?
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: First of all
16
    Michelle, very good report, and thank you for making the
17
18
    trip.
19
              I do have a question, because as -- as, you know,
    an L.A. County residency -- and I don't know, Jeff, if this
20
21
    is where we want to ask the question about the recent
2.2
    designation of our Angeles National Forest as a national
23
    monument by President Obama. But is this where we might
    want to talk about that or did we want to address that
24
25
    later?
```

1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: 2 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I just -- because 3 it's kind of wrapped into this particular --4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, if we're going to have 5 this discussion then I'm going to basically set aside the motion on it, because it's --6 7 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: That's fine, I just wasn't sure. That's fine. 8 9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- appropriate to have 10 information first and then have the motion, so let's go forward. 11 12 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Fine, thank you. 13 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Yes. As people 14 may know last week on Friday, the President designated a 15 portion of the Angeles National Forest as a national monument. That Angeles National Forest is between Palmdale 16 17 and Burbank and so it does come into question here certainly 18 what impact that might have. And a few points along those 19 lines. 20 One, we have not at this point identified a 21 specific alignment that would go there. What we have is a 2.2 broad study area. The designation of the national monument 2.3 is of not of the entire National Forest, it's of a segment 24 of it. And it may be the case that when, and if we get to a 25 determination of an alignment in that area, it may not in

fact touch the national monument area.

2.2

2.3

We have had specific direction from the federal agencies. We've talked to the Council on Environmental Quality, which is the agency that oversees the designation of these. They have made it clear that the designation does not preclude the evaluation of alternatives through here. It does not preclude the eventual construction and operation if we get through the environmental process, if all of the clearances are made, and if in fact this -- an alignment is selected in this area.

We don't know, frankly, if -- even if there were not a designation whether an alignment would be -- might be precluded through there for other reasons just as we go through the process. So I think the important points being again, there is no preclusion of the evaluation as a result of the designation.

We will work closely with the Forest Service and with the other agencies to make sure that our review is done with their collaboration, cooperation and that it takes into account all of the issues that -- along with the designation. But the designation itself does not affect our ability to move ahead at this stage of the program.

BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Thank you, Jeff.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Are there other questions on this item?

```
1
              (No responses from Board Members)
 2
              All right, with that a motion?
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So moved.
 3
 4
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Is there a second?
 5
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: A second.
              VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Second.
 6
 7
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. It's been moved by
    Director Rossi, seconded by Ms. Schenk and by Vice Chair
8
9
    Richards.
10
              Will the Secretary please call the roll?
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?
11
12
              BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.
1.3
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?
14
              VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.
15
              MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Hartnett?
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Yes.
16
17
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?
              BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.
18
19
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.
20
21
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?
2.2
              BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.
2.3
              MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?
2.4
              BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Yes.
25
              MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?
```

```
1
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.
 2
              MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?
 3
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.
                                        Thank you, Michelle.
              MS. BOEHM:
 4
                          Thank you.
 5
              CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Mr. Chairman,
    we're going to have Ms. Boehm write Tom's memos for him from
 6
 7
    now. I think we're going to --
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Actually, what I was -- I was
 8
9
    thinking since we believe that competition is in the public
10
    interest that we should give out gold stars. And then, you
11
    know, Mr. Tripope -- Mr. Tripousis and Ms. Gomez and
12
    Ms. Boehm can all compete. At the end of the year they can
    see who has the most gold stars or something.
13
14
              All right, the next item is item six, an update on
15
    the procurement for the PMT, the Program Management Team
16
    contract and the next steps.
17
              Mr. Jarvis, good morning.
18
              MR. JARVIS: Good morning, Chairman Richard and
    Board members.
19
20
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.
                           This is an informational item to
21
              MR. JARVIS:
2.2
    provide you with an update regarding the procurement of the
2.3
    Program Management Team or PMT.
2.4
              The California High-Speed Rail Program is
25
    expanding from focusing primarily on the planning and
```

preliminary design phases to project delivery and operations. So as the Authority evolves to meet these changing needs the roll of key consultants will need to be adjusted to reflect the status of the program.

2.2

The procurement of the PMT contract provides a timely opportunity to position the Authority to meet its evolving needs and objectives. The existing PMT contract expires on June 30th of 2015. And as has been the practice on other contracts, the Authority's intent is to competitively procure all contracts when feasible, as the Authority staff recommends procuring the PMT contract to match the Authority's needs and goals as we move forward.

So the overall scope of the PMT contract is to provide program management services, and the contract will continue to include support for strategic advice, business planning, and continued development in management assistance for the program. It will also include a greatly expanded focus on project delivery to ensure successful delivery and a cohesive program with technical and operational integration between the various projects and contracts into a common system.

So specific areas which will require a proven record of experience and success include advanced project management in program management systems, alternative delivery methods including public-private partnerships, P3s,

railroad systems and technical integration, specialized project delivery components such as tunneling and operations and maintenance of high-speed rail systems. So the expansion of the PMT scope of work will allow the Authority to benefit from experienced firms working together in partnership on the upcoming challenges of delivering the program.

2.2

2.3

So as the program transitions to focus more on project delivery, the Authority will also transition to ensure consistent oversight and transparency. The Authority structure is designed to have a comparatively lean civil service staff, we talked about that this morning, provide vision, overall direction and oversight of the program.

While the PMT will play a vital role in supporting cohesion and integration amongst the Authority's consultants and contractors, the Authority will also continue to expand relationships with other state agencies, which we also talked about -- particularly with Caltrans -- in key roles to assist in the delivery of the program and the statewide interconnection of the high-speed rail system with the state's existing inner-city rail and public transportation systems.

So staff recommends a five-year contract with the option to extend. And the contract will be structured around functional areas with performance metrics refined and

managed through an annual work plan or AWP. The contract will comply with the Authority's 30 percent small business goal.

The procurement schedule is intended to allow selection and award of the contract in a timeframe that will allow for any necessary transition period considering that the existing PMT contract expires on June 30th, 2015.

So a couple of key milestone dates as we move forward is a presentation of the RFQ to the Board for approval, which will take place in December of 2014 as well as a release of the RFQ, which will follow that in December. And the schedule is recommendation to contract award to Board in April of 2015. And then we will follow that up with a notice to proceed to the PMT in May of 2015.

So again, this is an informational item only. Staff does not recommend any action at this time. And I would be happy to answer any questions that the Board might have at this time.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Very good, very clear.

Ms. Selby?

2.2

BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yeah, I -- given the scrutiny that we gave the Nossaman contract I would like to give a little scrutiny to this one as well, along the same lines, about building capacity. I know that when we had our briefing with Tom Fellenz we talked about this a little bit.

```
1
              I just -- I would love to see is it possible to
 2
    put in the contract, the RFQ itself, the necessity of sort
    of looking to when it makes sense the Caltrans or other
 3
    places, which may have excess capacity before necessarily
 4
 5
    throwing it over to the private sector?
              MR. JARVIS: Yes, we could do that. We could put
 6
 7
    that in as a provision in the RFQ and then once we get a
    contractor on board we could work with them and help
 8
9
    facilitate that. So yeah, it's --
10
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Because I feel like not only
11
    with this help us as Californians, but hopefully this is the
12
    first high-speed rail and we'll be able to continue to build
    high-speed rail beyond California. And that whatever
13
14
    capacity we build here in California, both on the legal side
15
    and on, you know, the engineering side, could -- we could
    help the rest of the United States with that. So that's my
16
17
    thinking.
18
              MR. JARVIS: Yeah. Yeah, understood.
              BOARD MEMBER SELBY:
19
                                   Thanks.
20
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Ms. Perez-Estolano?
21
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I just have two
2.2
    questions. First of all --
2.3
              MR. JARVIS: Yes.
24
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: -- thank you for the
25
    report, Scott.
```

```
1
              MR. JARVIS: You're welcome.
 2
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Do you have a budget
 3
    range in mind on this one?
 4
              MR. JARVIS: Yeah, currently our --
 5
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I know that's
    probably I'm --
 6
 7
              CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: That'll be part
    of the transcript.
 8
9
              BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Okay.
                                                    Thank you.
10
    I'm just realizing -- thank you, Jeff. I appreciate that.
11
              The second thing is, in terms of the industry
12
    outreach, I would really ask given that we heard from folks
1.3
    in small businesses and such from Fresno and other areas
14
    let's make sure that we really work hard to -- to do our due
15
    diligence in making those connections.
16
              I know that -- and I appreciate very much that
17
    you've outlined it in your timeline, so if you could make
18
    sure that we -- we touch folks as much as possible, connect
19
    the primes to the subs and do all those things and work with
20
    our colleagues at the various different task forces that we
21
    have, advisory groups. That'd be really important to us.
2.2
    Thank you.
2.3
              MR. JARVIS: Yes.
2.4
              CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Vice Chair Hartnett?
25
              VICE CHAIR HARTNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
```

I think the theme that I look at under this PMT contract is one that we've discussed before. And that is those decisions that the government, the Authority as representing the government, that should be made by a governmental employee as compared to a private contractor.

2.2

2.3

2.4

It's important to keep that balance. And so as we move forward on this, and as we continue to staff up whether through a -- you know, a borrowing other employees or hiring from other departments so that they are our employee, I think we have to constantly bear in mind that those decisions that we should be making, as compared to a contractor, we -- we need to have that ability to do that. We're not delegating governmental decisions to -- to a private contractor in general.

And secondly, we still have to balance that as well with the fact that long term we don't want to be a big organization. And so that's again, another part of the balance of how many people can you bring on. And then, you know, tell them, "We're getting rid of you in two or three years." So I think that's another part of the equation that we need to look at, which is maybe a very difficult one to balance all those things. But I think that we have to keep all those in mind.

MR. JARVIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Vice Chair -- excuse me, I just

wanted to say Vice Chair Hartnett just made a number of comments that I was -- had in mind and made them more cogently than I would have. So I would associate myself with those remarks.

Mr. Rossi?

BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Same for me.

comments?

1.3

2.2

2.3

I would thank you for a very clear and informational update. We understand that there's no action here. I would just add one other comment, which is that this has been a very large-scale contract. It's been an extensive comprehensive effort by one program management technical consultant that we've had for several years. Sometimes that consultant themselves has been the subject of some controversy within the controversy entire high-speed rail project.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Other questions or

And I want everybody to understand that by this re-solicitation this really is following a management precept that has been laid down by our CEO, that I think the Board has been very, very comfortable with. And that is that it is healthy for the organization to have even the largest contractors or small contractors go through the process of re-competing.

And it's important for the public that we have the

opportunity to see if, notwithstanding the fact that someone has been working with us for a long time, if another group may have a more competitive idea, a more compelling story that would cause us to -- to step back and look at this.

And to go forward in the best interest of the public.

2.2

So this does not presuppose any dissatisfaction with this contractor, but it does say that it's in our interest and the public's interest that this is the time and place where this major contract should be re-competed. So I certainly think that the CEO has had a clear vision of this and as I said before, I think it's one that the Board has embraced.

So with that, Mr. Morales, I'll give you the last word, but also thank you Scott, for a very good presentation.

MR. JARVIS: You're welcome.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Yeah.

Mr. Chairman, just to follow on your comments, I think this is -- this is really a reflection of the evolution of the program and of the organization.

If you remember, the current contract was put in place when the Authority was what, probably less than a dozen people maybe? And it was, you know, a very different time in the organization's place. You know, we're now up to 170 or so and do, in fact as Mr. Hartnett pointed out, have

government people making government decisions. And we can be comfortable with that, so that just by that the nature of the contract needs to change.

But we're also moving forward into a new phase of the program. And some of the things that Scott talked about — the emphasis on not just project delivery, but also the perspective of operating the system and knowing how we'll have to act with concessionaires and how best to prepare ourselves to do that, speaks to a different mix of the skill sets that we need going forward. And so that's what this contract reflects and is absolutely consistent with that direction of always looking to reinvigorate through competition. And I think we'll be well-served by going forward this process.

And just on Ms. Perez-Estolano's comment, part of the reason we wanted to do this presentation was to make sure the industry knew that this will be out for re-procurement, so that they can engage. And people can see where those opportunities will be.

CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, very good. Okay.

21 Mr. Rossi?

2.2

BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I think this is the right place for this given what Jeff just said and some other things. Plus the really nice reports that were presented, other than Tom's, the really nice reports that were

presented here is -- is that if you haven't had a chance to really look at the Audit and Finance Committee reports one of the -- and Tom Richards can step in any time he thinks I'm screwing up, which he does regularly -- but is that if you look at these reports today one of the things that you will find that is much, much different -- at least from when I started, when we started Mr. Chairman -- is that you can take a look at a series of reports and pretty much understand where this operation is. And I think that that speaks to the enhanced oversight by the management of the Authority and the focus on trying to get it right.

2.2

2.3

And so I just want to echo the sentiments that I think Vice Chair Hartnett was saying about these reports at the Board. If you look at the Finance and Audit Committee reports I think that -- particularly if you were to look at them lineally from the beginning to where management has them today is very impressive. And it is fairly easy to understand where this -- where this Authority is from the point of view of Finance. And it's also fairly easy to see what is happening from the point of view of how the Audit operation, which is independent is looking at all of the things that need to be looked at.

And so I would just echo those thoughts, Jim, that the presentations here are getting much, much better and much more of substance.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, said. Okay, without --2 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: I actually had a question? 3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes, Ms. Selby? BOARD MEMBER SELBY: I'm very interested in the 4 5 budget and the finance and I -- the couple of times that I've been have been really, really helpful. 6 7 And I'm just wondering -- this is kind of following on earlier comments -- would it be possible to 8 9 have some sort of or do we already and I just haven't been 10 here long enough, regular update from the Budget and Finance 11 Committee to the regular Board just kind of letting us know 12 where we are? That may solve a lot of the issues that we're having with sort of how does this relate to the budget? 13 14 Where are we? That kind of thing. At least I would find it 15 helpful. 16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I think the intention, and the 17 practice, has been quarterly reports. I don't know if this 18 is a calendar quarter, a Julian quarter, or a Jeff Morales 19 quarter, but some kind of quarter. 20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: We should. If we aren't 21 doing it as regularly as we should we can start at the next 2.2 Board meeting. 2.3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah. Why don't we pick up on 24 third quarter report at the next Board meeting? I think that would be --25

BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Tom Richards makes a very good presentation. CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Tom Richards does. All right, without further ado then I think the Board will enter into, what I believe is going to be a very short closed session. Tom Fellenz has another memo for us. No, I'm just kidding. And we'll report back immediately after that. We'll be in recess. (The High-Speed Rail Authority meeting convened into Closed Session at 10:59 a.m.) (The meeting reconvened at 12:22 and having no further business, Chairperson Dan Richard adjourned the meeting) --000--2.2

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 29th day of October 2014.

Kent Odell CER**00548

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 22nd day of October, 2014.

Vem Harper

Terri Harper Certified Transcriber AAERT No. CET**D-709